DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 706 UD 008 548

By-Kilpatrick, William H.

Modern Education and Better Human Relations. Freedom Pamphlets.

B'nai B'rith, New York, N.Y. Anti-Defamation League.
Pub Date 57
Note-23p.
Available from-Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022 ($.35)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
Descriptors-Changing Attitudes, Cross Cultural Training, *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Educational Philosophy, *Educational Responsibility, *Human Relations, Intergroup Education, Intergroup Relations, Parent Attitudes, Racial Discrimination, Racism, Religious Discrimination, Social Discrimination, Student Attitudes, Teacher Attitudes, Teaching Methods

This 1957 pamphlet discusses bias against minority groups, discriminatory attitudes and acts, and the need to replace discrimination with better human relations. In this context, the role of schools, and of education in general, in teaching positive intergroup relations is defined. The modern concept of education emphasizes "living" what is to be learned and helping the child to grow "gradually into the fulness of individual and social living." Specifically, the goals should be learning to live together, acceptance by parents and teachers of these goals, teaching children anti-discriminatory behaviors, intercultural understanding, and self examination of prejudice. For older students, study of the psychology of race and of the rationalizations which support racism is recommended. (NH)

GUIDELINES: CLASSROOM
INTERGROUP EDUCATION PRACTICES

EDO 30706

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
PROGRAM COLLECTION

08548E

UD 008 549

MODERN EDUCATION *and* BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS

by
WM. H. KILPATRICK

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

Bennett O. Stalvey

Freedom is more than a word. It is a deeply cherished belief in the essential importance of the person and in the supremacy of a society which respects and safeguards the eminent dignity and integrity of personality.

Freedom is a creative spirit that summons the energies of all men to the task of building the kind of community, the kind of nation, the kind of world in which they want to live. It is a dream of a world in which all men, women, and children are encouraged to grow to their fullest—physically, mentally, spiritually—so that they may fulfill the great promise of their inner potential.

But freedom is more than a belief or a dream. Freedom is also a process; as such it is concerned with means as with ends, seeking through democratic methods to create the good society.

The education of free men to understand their proper role in a free society is basic to such a process. To this task the ***FREEDOM PAMPHLET*** Series is dedicated.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MODERN EDUCATION and BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS

UD 008 548

by
WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright — 1949, 1957, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Printed in the United States of America

Freedom Pamphlets are published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Officers: HENRY EDWARD SCHULTZ, *national chairman;* MEIER STEINBRINK, *honorary chairman;* BARNEY BALABAN, A. G. BALLENGER, A. K. COHEN, FRANK R. S. KAPLAN, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, LEON LOWENSTEIN, WILLIAM SACHS, BENJAMIN SAMUELS, MELVIN H. SCHLESINGER, JESSE STEINHART, *honorary vice-chairmen;* JOSEPH COHEN, JEFFERSON E. PEYSER, MAX J. SCHNEIDER, *vice-chairmen;* JACOB ALSON, *treasurer;* HERBERT LEVY, *secretary;* BERNARD NATH, *chairman, national executive committee;* PAUL SAMPLINER, *vice-chairman;* BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN, *national director.*

Editors of Freedom Pamphlet series: OSCAR COHEN, *director, national program division;* OSCAR TARCOV, *director, publications department.*

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

William H. Kilpatrick, professor emeritus of the philosophy of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, has had a long and distinguished career as an educator and leader of the progressive education movement in this country. He has written numerous books and articles on child education, and on the principles and methods which underlie democratic and inter-group education. Among his books are *Education for a Changing Civilization, Group Education for a Democracy,* and *Intercultural Attitudes in the Making.*

CONTENTS

	Page
THE SITUATION AND THE PROBLEM	7
THE KIND OF EDUCATION NEEDED TO TEACH BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS . . .	11
ACTUAL TEACHING IN BEHALF OF BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS	17
BIBLIOGRAPHY	23

THE SITUATION AND THE PROBLEM

Modern education, if it is to be its true self, must aim at the good life both socially and individually. It must also support and promote better human relations wherever these are now not satisfactory. Good human relations constitute an essential ingredient of the good life. We mean by good human relations exactly those ways of mutual human behavior which by common consent are recognized as essential to promoting and safeguarding the desired quality of human living.

Education, a true education, must be concerned with all human rights, but we are here most concerned with those rights most characteristically denied to minority groups among us by the relatively homogeneous dominant majority.

The denial of these rights and the consequent bad effect on human relations may become a very serious matter. Lord Acton, the English historian, said a generation ago that "the provision made in any state for the rights of minorities is the best test of the standard of civilization in that state." The criterion Lord Acton applied to the world at large we must apply to our country on the inside and from the outside; on the inside, as to how we treat the minorities in our midst; from the outside, as to how the world views our home treatment of these minorities.

By minority, as herein understood, we mean any sub-group of our people which is denied a fair and equal chance to live associatively with the rest of the population. The people of Scottish ancestry now living among us who wish to come together with kilt and bonnet and bagpipe to celebrate the birthday of Robert Burns, despite the fact that they may in a degree hold themselves as different from the rest, constitute no minority as that term is here used. No one denies them any privilege because of their special interest in Burns or former Scottish life. But the members of certain other groups are often denied privileges that all men hold dear. In this country, this

is most true of Negroes, Jews, Roman Catholics, and other groups. The special topic of study here is the denial of rights to individuals simply because they belong to certain groups.

Life in any good and full sense involves participation by all on terms of mutual respect and the acceptance of the principle of equality of opportunity. We may take this as the democratic aspect of the good life. For democracy has come to mean more than a kind of government. It now reaches beyond the legal aspects of government into the animating spirit of ethics and friendship. Such a democracy is founded primarily on respect for human personality. And this respect is meaningless except in terms of equality of opportunity or, more generally, of equality of human rights.

The professed American position on such matters stands clear. The Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal," not equal in ability or height or size, but equal in respect of human rights. The Constitution, especially with its various amendments, is strong in supporting the legal equality of the claim to such rights. The Hebraic-Christian tradition, historically strong in the religious groups of our country, is most explicit: "For God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth"; "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise"; "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

But as against these professions we have far too much of bias and discrimination practiced not only against the three principal minorities named above, but against Chinese, Japanese, East Indians, Mexicans, and other such groups. In many respects these various minorities suffer serious discrimination and denial of equality of opportunity. These discriminatory practices not only lower the quality of life in our country, they endanger our position as a constructive force in the family of nations.

We must therefore find some way of educating ourselves to a more moral wiser, and more defensible outlook and behavior in this matter of inter-group bias and discrimination.

In order to deal intelligently with this most serious problem, let us begin by studying it. How have these attitudes arisen psychologically and historically?

We have as partial explanation of the denial of equal rights the old historic factor of human exploitation, the selfish use of man by man. Here we face selfish exploitation developed into custom and institution. Slavery, serfdom, and caste are examples of the ways in which the underprivileged have been made to serve the advantage of their social superiors. Lower position in our present-day socio-

economic scale almost inevitably brings with it less of the good life. It appears probable that a certain amount of the existing attitude toward Negroes in this country results from an institutionalized attitude of exploitation. It appears further probable that much of a former attitude toward "labor" and labor organizations had its origins here. In the degree that this lower economic position is due to any institutionalized denial of equality of opportunity, in like degree must democracy condemn such denial.

Secondly, there is a "psychological" component of bias and discrimination attitudes. This psychological component works at times quite independently of present differences of wealth, and is an example of the wrong development of "we-group" attitudes. "We," properly used, is perhaps close to the essence of morality; but "we" can be used in a quite different manner to shut others out. The Greeks, for example, called outsiders "barbarians" and therein gave us the meaning of the words "barbarian" and "barbarous"; for that is how they thought of outsiders. When the we-group idea is so crystallized into a custom-held boundary that others are regularly excluded, discrimination results.

In order to rationalize these discriminatory acts, defense mechanisms are brought into play.

One such defense mechanism is an unwarranted belief in race — in the belief there are very sharply defined races which differ innately from each other in ability and other endowments. The facts seem to be that the term race, in so far as it has been defined, is restricted to certain physiological differences such as color of skin, color of eyes, cast of features, kind of hair. Beyond that, scientific investigation offers no valid reason for believing that existing races differ from each other, innately, in any psychological attribute.

A second such defense mechanism is the bad logic of imputing individual shortcomings to all the members of an out-group; if one of "our" group does wrong, *he* is a bad man; if one of an out-group does wrong, *they* are like that. By the same token, we are unaware of the faults of "our" group and fail to take note of the good traits of the "out" group.

A third defense mechanism is rumor-mongering, the spreading of false rumors to the disadvantage of the out-group. When our unprecedented war industry allowed Negro cooks and serving maids to leave domestic employment, their disconcerted mistresses spread the rumor that "Eleanor Clubs" were the explanation of their loss of cooks and maids, that under the guidance of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt the Negro women were now uniting against their former mis-

tresses. It need hardly be said that no instance of such a club has been found. While the lower reaches of the social-economic scale easily breed certain types of social evil, rumor-mongering seems most to come from the upper reaches; threatened privilege seemingly takes this very common course.

Within the last decade there has been a growing awareness of the need for better human relations and a determination to do something about it. More people are thinking about the problem and working at its solution than was ever true before. But still the goal has not yet been achieved.

Our professed ethics and democracy already embody in the Declaration of Independence and in the amendments to our Constitution definite commitment to the principle of "equal rights for all, special privileges for none." Many among us would be willing to proceed at once to abolish our minority discriminations. Our problem is thus a cultural lag. We have in theory and in official profession abolished these discriminations, but they still live on to plague us.

By "cultural lag" we mean the persistence of old ways of thinking, feeling, and acting after the defense of these old ways has been logically destroyed. Fear of "thirteen" is an instance of such lag. There is absolutely no sense in it, but many people still fear it. Many tall buildings even have no "13th" floor! Astrology is another such lag. The planets have no specific effects on human destinies; but the last decade of defeatism resulting from wars and depressions has seen more books on astrology sold in this country than ever before. In such a situation we must recognize that a deeply ingrained cultural pattern of thought and action is usually hard to eradicate. The more any such pattern relates to values and aims, and not as mere means to ends, the harder to dislodge. The greater the degree to which the old idea or practice has been accepted, the more likely it is to survive.

A proper study of how such cultural lags manage to perpetuate themselves will help us to adopt positive plans for eradicating them. Our problem becomes, then, that of education, of helping parents and children and communities to give up bias and prejudice and discrimination in favor of a proper and decent treatment of all.

THE KIND OF EDUCATION NEEDED TO TEACH BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS

An enlightened and sensitive democracy, properly aware of the world today, will demand better human relations both at home and abroad. Decent ethics and religion will support and reinforce the demand. With these things granted, there follows at once the questions: How can education do its part to help bring about better relations? What kind of education is needed if the school is to do its part in bettering this evil situation of tension, bias, and discrimination?

Most people, when they think of schools and teaching, recall the schools of their youth: desks screwed down in straight rows; no pupil-conferring allowed in the classroom; textbooks with the next "lesson" on the "next ten pages" assigned for study; reciting in class what had thus been set-out-to-be-learned; good marks for success in giving it back, bad marks for failure; monthly report cards, parental reproof for a bad report. Such is the school that was, and too often still is.

Can such a school meet the need confronting it? Can the memorizing of assigned lessons change one's habits and attitudes? Will the child from a Ku Klux or anti-Semitic home change his attitude toward Negro, Jew or Catholic because his textbook tells him to accept them as friends? How does such memorizing affect other aspects of life? Does learning the words of the catechism suffice to make one a faithful follower of the religion set forth in the catechism?

Memorizing words from a book will not of itself change habits and attitudes. If anyone demands proof of what has just been said, let him read Hartshorne and May's, "Studies In Deceit." They found in their studies of deceit that a guiding care by the right kind of family will help, for such a family really educates; but whether the child of this good family does or does not go to Sunday

school, and how much he goes, has no signifiant effect on day-school cheating. It appears then that learning about bias and prejudice will not remove bias and prejudice. Some other way of teaching and learning must be found.

This brings us to the crucial factor in effective teaching and learning. For over a hundred and fifty years a revolution in education has been in process. Various social changes have modified the school. The growth of science, the decline of authoritarianism, the growth of democracy with its understanding of and respect for human personality — these and more have had their effect, and the school is now very different from what it once was. But the change is still in process.

How shall we understand the essential difference between old and new?

We have inherited from Alexandria in Egypt of the third and fourth centuries B.C. a school devised to teach the written book; for Greece had given to the world its surpassing wisdom found in the books of its great writers. This Alexandrian school was taken to Rome to give to the Romans this written wisdom of the Greeks. Christianity used the same type of school to maintain unimpaired its authoritarian doctrines. The Revival of Learning used this same school for teaching the revived classics. Only with the coming of Pestalozzi (1764-1827) did the Alexandrian outlook begin to be seriously questioned. The new conception, which since Pestalozzi has been much developed, stresses behaving as the basis of learning.

The old method exists to teach the content of the book or other authoritative ideas. Its method is the textbook or, in college, the lecture. Its main appeal is to memory. The hope of this older method is that the learner will retain in memory the ideas given in the assigned lessons or lectures and will use these ideas later when the appropriate time shall come. In other words, this still influential Alexandrian type of teaching reduces man to mind, and mind largely to memory, in the vain and unwarranted hope that ideas about a thing will at the right time bring about appropriate behavior. It is evident, however, that character is built only from conduct, and good character only from actual thoughtful and moral behavior. But the Alexandrian school has in its scheme no place for behavior, no regard for building moral character through actual conduct. All that this older outlook does, at the best, is to teach ideas *about* conduct and, at the worst, to teach mere words, often meaningless words, frequently with resulting aversion to all they mean.

It requires little or no argument to make us believe that such

teaching by itself utterly fails and will forever fail at getting rid of actual bias and prejudice. We must find a more effective type of teaching and learning. Fortunately we have available a very different outlook.

By contrast then with the old, the new outlook centers attention on behavior and on character building, on the whole personality, on "the whole child." This new education places emphasis on the ability to take one's full part in life as the inclusive goal of its educative endeavor. As it considers the process more closely, this education sees as its nearer goal an expanding all-round character, healthy of body, well poised and integrated emotionally, intellectually interested and alert, able to bring thought appropriately to bear on the proper efforts of expanding life, morally alert and responsible to the proper demands of social and individual life, esthetically able to enjoy increasingly life's possibilities. Looking at the learning process as means, this education holds that anyone, of whatever age, learns what he *lives* — learns his responses and *all* his responses *as* he accepts them in his heart as his way of living. It further holds that one learns these responses *in the degree* that he *lives* them, that is, in the degree that the matter seems important to him and that this particular response promises to help attain his goal, and in the further degree that what he now does and thinks fits in well with what he has already been thinking and doing. This new education holds, finally, that what is thus learned is therein and thereby built at once into character.

The new education puts emphasis on the whole child and on the quality of his living, the school being a place devised to facilitate the best possible living; for the child will learn what he lives. This means that if the child is to learn democracy, he must live democracy — live democracy by being himself so treated and by his so treating others. Similarly, if he is to learn responsibility, he must himself exercise responsibility in a setting where specific responsibility counts as such. And, finally, if the child or youth is to learn respect for others of a different group — race or religion or nationality — he must in his heart accept that respect and actually live it in his normal human relations.

If then we are really in earnest about improving intergroup relations through education, we shall seek to utilize the modern conception of education with its emphasis on *living* what is to be learned in its natural and normal setting. If the pupils of any minority group have been pushed aside, or discriminated against, or even left alone by their classmates, bad learnings on both sides have been going on in greater or lesser *degree*.

On the one hand, those who did the ignoring or rejecting, to the extent that they were conscious of what they did and so accepted this ignoring or rejecting as their way of behaving, to the like extent have they been building this ignoring and rejecting as abiding traits in their character. Even those who were least conscious of intent in the matter were still learning thus to overlook and disregard others who could and should have been given a conscious place in school activities.

And, on the other hand, those minority children who were thus shut out more or less consciously from the normal life of the group, what were they learning from what they lived? These children were certainly responding as normal persons do to the treatment they received: all of them by pain; some by angry resentment, perhaps hidden, perhaps in part expressed; some by refusing to yield to rejection; others by feeling increasing sensitivity through the years — all but the most exceptional responding by tendencies toward some kind and degree of maladjustment to the frustrations thus received.

The teacher of these children must know these things and be keenly alive to what is going on among the children. And knowing these things, the teacher must plan with all the ingenuity possible how to bring about wholesome living in all of them. The proper emphasis in school, in every school, must then be on living, on a quality of living that will make the school life properly educative; for whatever these pupils live, that they will learn. This principle is the crux of the school effort in all education, but especially the crux of proper intergroup education.

It may help at this point to distinguish two kinds of learning which teachers need to keep in mind, *direct* or intentional learning and indirect or by-product or *concomitant* learning. The direct learning the teacher assigns or the learner himself undertakes as an inherent part of his purposeful activity. The concomitant learnings, as it were, intrude themselves unintendedly into whatever else is going on. Because this second or intrusive (concomitant) learning has not been so much discussed, an illustration may help to clarify it.

Here is a pupil of recent immigration stock in an American public school. He has learned at school and on the street to speak English, but his parents are still limited to their old speech. This puts the boy at a disadvantage in school. The other children can get help on their homework from their parents or older brothers and sisters; this boy cannot. His class work may thus suffer. If so, each successive failure adds to his concomitant learnings of dis-

couragement, distrust of himself, and dislike of school. These undesired and undesirable learnings will be strengthened when some unfeeling classmates jeer at him and call him an ignorant "Wop." He thus further learns to be ashamed of his parents and of the country they came from; he learns also to hate these jeering boys and to hate school.

These unsought learnings, these indirect or intrusive or by-product or concomitant learnings, are very important — in fact, *all*-important — in character and personality building. This immigrant boy may now be already started on the highway to truancy and delinquency. His parents, sad to say, have lost much of their influence on him.

It was the same concomitant learnings that we met in the discriminations discussed above against minority children — bad concomitant learnings both in those who did the discriminating and in those who suffered the discriminations. In fact, probably most of the problem of teaching intercultural education lies in dealing with bad concomitant learnings, attitudes brought to school and strengthened, on both sides, by unkind behavior. And teachers may fail to deal properly with sneering remarks and insulting nicknames. Worst of all, some teachers have been so inconsiderate as themselves to indulge in such.

The cumulative aspect of these concomitant learnings calls for specific notice. Traits result from repeated instances of a certain type of response. Each such experience gives a somewhat different setting. The result is more than mere added strength through repetition; rather is it the accumulation of the typical conditions under which the trait will be called into play.

My conception of a dog, for instance, is the pooled and organized result of all my varied experiences of all the different kinds of dogs I have met. There is a common core, alike for all, which we may say, logically defines dog; but the differences also are there, so organized as to give expectancy range of what I may reasonably anticipate about any particular dog I see or hear about. There are many different colors I can expect as possible, but no green or purple dog. As to size, no dog is six feet tall.

This is also the way in which attitudes are built; the building of each conception carries a number of possible attitudes in its train; and each attitude as well carries its varying meaning connections according to conditions of use. It is in this way that ideals, standards and principles of action are always in process of being built.

As opposed to this the true cumulative way of building such traits the consistent Alexandrian teacher has mistakenly thought that we learn these conceptions, standards, attitudes and principles from his words when we learn the definitions, formulations and the like as given in his books. In other words, the Alexandrian teacher knows in effect nothing of these cumulated concomitant learnings — they cannot be assigned or recited to the teacher or given back in answer on examination. So the Alexandrian teacher ignores these as learnings unless as outward behavior they become intolerable. This then is another count in the severe indictment of the Alexandrian school.

The modern teacher will be most sensitive to these concomitant learnings; for they are the stuff out of which good or bad character, and wholesome or unwholesome personality are all the time being built. While book learning is important — there could be no civilization as we know it without books — still at any one time in the child's life it seems reasonably certain that these concomitant or by-product learnings are more strategic for life than anything else happening to the child. This stone which the Alexandrian builders refused becomes thus the headstone of the true educational corner.

ACTUAL TEACHING IN BEHALF OF BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS

The inclusive aim of modern teaching is to help the child grow gradually into fullness of individual and social living.

The infant starts life helpless and ignorant. But he can learn and as he continually learns he is reconstructing and integrating his character. He not only can learn, but as we have seen he will learn what he really lives and he will learn this in the degree that he lives it. Moreover, as we have further seen, the child learns all over; he is building many simultaneous learnings all his waking time. The end at which conscious educative effort must aim is good quality living, living of a quality fit to be built into character for the next stage of living — and if possible into lasting character.

Our American democracy has set for itself certain principles of associated living: (1) respect for personality as such, a regard for personality as the most sacred thing known among men, specifically that each individual shall have equal opportunity to make of himself the best that in him lies; (2) individual liberty of action, freedom to be and express one's self, conditioned however on the like freedom for others; so that in the end, equality of rights limits this right to freedom; (3) ethics, the behavior of men toward one another, founded on this respect for personality and this liberty limited to equal rights for all. It must, however, be added that ethics further derives from the principle of respect for personality and the positive obligation upon all to work for the common good. Out of these principles of ethical action democracy sets up its aim for education: that it shall seek to develop character in each one to support this inclusive conception of the good life.

In accordance with this conception of democratic education we now proceed to set up certain goals which should hold specifically in the area of better human relations; to ask how to teach so as most

surely to reach these goals; and to set up criteria for judging success of teaching and learning.

Our first goal is that *all pupils shall learn to live well together.* This means that no one shall feel unwelcome, or even be questioned because of the group to which he belongs; that all shall live in mutual helpfulness, with mutual respect and appreciation without any group discrimination, solely on the basis of personal merit sympathetically appraised.

To effect this sort of aim the school must be run, not on the Alexandrian plan of learning assigned lessons, but on the modern basis of living, real child living, according to the age and development of the children — on the basis of purposes which children can and do feel; purposes which, under proper teacher guidance, children themselves propose and decide to pursue. When children of diverse groups can start early enough thus living together, purposing together, planning and executing together, judging together, there will be little danger that they will not grow to respect each other exactly as persons, with little or no thought as to the varied groups from which they come. It is of course true that home teachings may interfere — a matter we shall consider in a moment — but with the younger children this danger is usually not great.

In the high school years, home and community attitudes will come to be a matter of greater moment, and may at times prove very difficult. But if this does not interfere too much, pupils as they grow older should consciously consider this better way of living together as the democratic way of life, and also as the recognized social-ethical way of living. Specifically, the scientific aspects of the problem should be studied in order to understand the best opinions on race and the absence of psychological race differences. In all of this, at whatever age, the more fully the pupils can carry the responsibilty for studying and concluding, the more effective will be the resultant learning.

The criterion for judging success here is, as with all true learning, not the ability to recite or stand examinations, but evidence of the degree of growth toward the goal as best conceived. *To what degree do my pupils actually live the various constituents of this inclusive good life? How fully do they live friendliness across group lines, with no discriminations shown? Do they live thus not only in school but also at home and in the community?* Merely to learn *about* such matters will not suffice; nor will it satisfy merely to learn that they are counted morally desirable. These attitudes must be accepted to act on and live by. And we can be sure that education

along this line will go on best in the modern type of school where children can and do actually live and work associatedly together.

Our second goal is that *parents and the citizens of the community accept these same goals for themselves and encourage their children so to live.*

This is of course a "hard saying," perhaps a very difficult goal to attain, and many will say that we cannot ask so much of the school. In a way, the objection is valid: we can neither demand nor expect the school to remake the whole community. But in another way the school should accept this as a goal to seek. Others in the community should share in the effort, but the school should consciously accept its obligation to work in this direction.

Probably the best ways of work here lie along two lines. First, and always, the teachers and parents should learn to work together at the common task of educating the children. And each side should come to understand the other, so that common aims and common attitudes may prevail. This again is much easier said than done, but it must be one conscious line of endeavor. The second is more pretentious. Each school community should have a community council composed of community leaders, social workers, and school people. This council should accept the task of studying the wider educational needs of the community, proper recreation grounds, no deleterious slums, adequate public library service, museums, a zoo, financial support of the public schools, the best available political machinery for managing the schools, proper public regard for intergroup tensions, proper measures to prevent bias and discrimination in employment, housing, and health facilities.

This second line of effort is so comprehensive and entails so much work in so many communities that at first the community council will have to start with the features *nearest in reach* and only gradually reach out actively into the full program. We can easily grant that a gradual program is wise, but the aim remains the same. The council should move as fast as it can to the full program.

In carrying out the actual program in the community, it will be most educative for the pupils to have a real part in the process; and this part should not be merely to carry out orders handed down from above. If the older pupils can make surveys of needs and have a real part in the needed planning, they will then work with a different attitude and the educative effort will be far greater, even on the other pupils.

And again the criteria of success will be: (1) What new measures have we really attempted? (2) What actual success have we achieved in concrete community living? (3) What actual changes of attitude do we find (a) in the community, and (b) perhaps most important of all, in those who have worked together in the effort?

A third goal is that *teachers in the schools shall themselves accept and live the finer and better attitudes in group relations.*

This is of course the crucial question if the schools are to be counted on to work for better intergroup relations. In certain public schools of a large city known to me, the Protestant teachers when lunch time comes segregate themselves in one dining room, the Catholics in a second dining room, and the Jews in a third. As long as this practice prevails, little can be expected from those schools by way of breaking down inter-religious prejudices in the pupils. This seems to be one instance where existing overt action will speak louder than any words to the contrary that these teachers may use.

A fourth goal is that *children shall increasingly understand how those who suffer discrimination feel, and then act accordingly.*

There are, to be sure, delicate problems involved here, and teachers ought to be sensitive to these problems. Such matters need not be so treated as to increase the painful feelings consequent upon discrimination. Nor should children go home to anger their parents who have not yet come as far as they should in such matters. Nor should this effort at understanding be pushed upon children not yet "ready" to understand and feel what is involved. But after all is said, it remains an essential part of the intercultural problem that the young of the dominant group should at length come to understand what is involved in bias and discrimination toward the members of minority groups.

This obligation is perhaps peculiarly difficult in a school which has on its roll no members of minority groups. Many such schools say: "We have no minority problems." But they overlook their own particular problem. Such schools easily crystallize status quo prejudices, just because they "have no problems" to force consideration.

A fifth goal is that *each group shall know and respect the cultural contributions of other groups.*

This is one specific way of meeting the democratic ethical demand of respect for personality. Nothing is more important than that each one respect himself. Where the dominant majority writes the textbooks and sets the general tone, it is easy for the child of

the minority group to feel humiliated as he contrasts his group (as he knows it) with the standards seemingly accepted about him. Many immigrant families have thus been torn within, as their children have learned to look down on their parents and on the group to which they belong.

If wisely managed, this effort at appreciating the different cultural contributions may help to build both a new respect for other groups and a deeper and more intelligent self-respect for each one's own group.

A sixth goal is that *each one may, as age increases, learn to reconsider objectively his own prejudices.* To learn, under tactful guidance, one's own prejudices may help persuade one to give up these prejudices.

A prejudice is a position taken before, or without, proper effort at judging. A conviction is a judgment reached through careful study. Each honest and intelligent person should be ashamed to harbor prejudices.

A seventh goal is that *older boys and girls shall for themselves study the evidence regarding the psychology of race.* Really to get the facts and understand the arguments in connection with them will generally help one to give up race prejudice as well as to give one the basis for holding the scientifically defensible position.

An eighth goal is that the *older students — and teachers — shall study and evaluate the various reasons and rationalizations which in the past supported discriminations.* To have seen through these rationalizations is to help make one immune against most of the common prejudices.

We can hardly conclude this list of goals on a better note than to recall and stress that modern education, in contrast with the Alexandrian, is concerned primarily with building character, with developing in the child as he grows constantly older a character from which good living is the result. And further, that the only way to build such character is by living its various constituents. *We learn what we live, we learn each response as we accept it for our living purposes, and we learn it in the degree that we live it. And what we thus learn we therein build at once into character.* This is the sole basis on which proper character can be built.

Our American life in spite of its many excellencies still has in it too much of intergroup stress and strain caused by bias and prejudice and discrimination. These faults are present and active in

the degree that there is a denial of our professed American democracy. We hurt too many people in our midst, and we endanger our influence in the world, by continuing these discriminations. Intercultural education is the determined effort, by living and through living to eliminate these discriminations from our American life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brameld, Theodore, MINORITY PROBLEMS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1946.

Edman, Marion and Collins, Laurentine B., PROMISING PRACTICES IN INTERGROUP EDUCATION, Bureau for Intercultural Education, New York, 1947.

Kilpatrick, William H. and Van Til, William, editors, INTERCULTURAL ATTITUDES IN THE MAKING, Ninth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947.

Taba, Hilda and Van Til, William, editors, DEMOCRATIC HUMAN RELATIONS, National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1945.

Tumin, Melvin M., editor, SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION: A Digest of Recent Research, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York, 1957.

Vickery, William E. and Cole, Stewart G., INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943.

AMERICANS ALL: Studies in Intercultural Education, Department of Supervisors and Directors, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1942.

A PROGRAM OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION IN SAN DIEGO, The Pacific Coast Council of Intercultural Education, Los Angeles, 1947.

CURRENT PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN HUMAN RELATIONS EDUCATION, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York, 1956.

FROM SEA TO SHINING SEA, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., 1946

REGIONAL PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN HUMAN RELATIONS EDUCATION, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York, 1957.

STUDY OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS, American Association of Teachers Colleges, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1945.

THE ENGLISH JOURNAL (Intercultural Education Issue), Prepared for the National Council of Teachers of English, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, June, 1946.